

Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 STATE 056699

13

ORIGIN NEA-10

INFO OCT-01 AF-06 EUR-12 IO-11 PRS-01 ISO-00 SSM-05 PA-02

USIA-15 INR-07 /070 R

DRAFTED BY NEA/P:MVANORDER:DP

APPROVED BY NEA/P:GFSHERMAN

S/PRS - MR. FUNSETH (INFO)

H - MR. FLATEN (INFO)

EUR/P - MR. JERABEK

IO/P - MR. BLACHLY

SSM - MS. GREEN

NEA/ARP - MR. AHERNE

AF/P - MR. POPE

NEA - MS. GRIFFIN

----- 051155

R 090128Z MAR 76

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO AMEMBASSY ALGIERS

AMEMBASSY AMMAN

AMEMBASSY BEIRUT

AMEMBASSY CAIRO

AMEMBASSY DAMASCUS

USMISSION GENEVA

AMEMBASSY JIDDA

AMEMBASSY KUWAIT

AMCONSUL DHAHRAN

AMCONSUL JERUSALEM

AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM

AMEMBASSY MANAMA

AMEMBASSY TEHRAN

AMEMBASSY TEL AVIV

AMEMBASSY TRIPOLI

AMEMBASSY RABAT

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY ROME

USMISSION USUN NEW YORK

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 STATE 056699

USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY SANA
AMEMBASSY TUNIS
USINT BAGHDAD
AMEMBASSY DOHA
AMEMBASSY ABU DHABI
AMEMBASSY NOUAKCHOTT
AMEMBASSY MOGADISCIO
USMISSION SINAI
CINCEUR

UNCLAS STATE 056699

GENEVA FOR MEPC DEL, CINCEUR FOR POLAD

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PFOR

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT PRESS BRIEFING

FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE FOLLOWING ARE EXCERPTS
FROM DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN'S PRESS BRIEFING FOR MARCH 8, 1976

STATEMENT: I HAVE RECEIVED A LOT OF QUESTIONS THIS MORN-
ING FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENT ON THE SHEEHAN ARTICLE WHICH
APPEARED IN "FOREIGN POLICY" TODAY.

FIRST, I WOULD JUST LIKE TO REITERATE THE RESPONSES
WE MADE TO QUESTIONS ON FRIDAY, AND WHICH WE CIRCULATED ON
FRIDAY AFTERNOON.

I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO REITERATE THAT INSOFAR AS ANY
STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS PROVIDED MR. SHEEHAN WITH IN-
FORMATION BASED DIRECTLY ON MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATION, THIS
WAS UNAUTHORIZED, WAS A SERIOUS ERROR OF JUDGMENT, AND
DISCIPLINARY ACTION WILL BE TAKEN.

Q --- I ANT TO

Q. I WANT TO ASK THIS: DOES THE SECRETARY KNOW WHO
THE OFFICIAL, OR OFFICIALS, WERE WHO DID THIS?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 STATE 056699

A. IT IS IN THE CONDITIONAL -- "INSOFAR AS ANY --"

Q. WELL, YOU ARE SAYING DISCIPLINARY ACTION WILL BE
TAKEN.

A. YES -- "INSOFAR AS ANY STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL
PROVIDED --"

Q. WAIT A MINUTE, LET ME GET THIS CLEAR.

Q. YOU ARE LOOKING INTO IT?

A. YES.

Q. HAVE YOU HAD ANY QUESTIONS OR PROTESTS FROM ANY FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS ABOUT THOSE ALLEGED VERBATIM CONVERSATIONS?

A. NOT THAT I AM AWARE OF.

Q. AND PRESUMABLY YOU WOULD BE AWARE IF THAT HAD BEEN?

A. RIGHT.

Q. SO IN OTHER WORDS, "NO."

A. AS FAR AS I KNOW.

I WOULD HAVE TO QUALIFY THAT THAT DOESN'T NECESSARILY MEAN THAT IF WE HAD, WE WOULD ANSWER YOUR QUESTION. BECAUSE AS YOU KNOW, WE USUALLY DO NOT GET INTO DISCUSSING DIPLOMATIC EXCHANGES WE HAVE WITH OTHER GOVERNMENTS.

BUT THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION, AS I SAID ORIGINALLY, IS THAT I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY SPECIFIC PROTESTS.

Q. I HAVE A SERIES OF QUESTIONS I WANT TO ASK YOU ON THE SHEEHAN CIRCUMSTANCE, AND THE FALLOUT FROM THAT:

DOES THE STATE DEPARTMENT SEE ANY DISTINCTION BETWEEN THESE LEAKS FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE LEAKS IN CONGRESS WHICH HAVE BEEN SO ROUNDLY DENOUNCED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AS MCCARTHYISM AND GREAT JEOPARDY TO AMERICAN NATIONAL INTERESTS?

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 STATE 056699

TWEEN THESE LEAKS FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE LEAKS IN CONGRESS WHICH HAVE BEEN SO ROUNDLY DENOUNCED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AS MCCARTHYISM AND GREAT JEOPARDY TO AMERICAN NATIONAL INTERESTS?

A. FIRST, I THINK YOU NEED TO GO BACK TO WHAT WE SAID ON FRIDAY, WHICH I THINK YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU. WE ARE SAYING THAT IN HIS CONTACTS HERE MR. SHEEHAN DID NOT SEE ANY TRANSCRIPTS OF MEMORANDA OR OFFICIAL RECORDS, AND HE WAS NOT AUTHORIZED TO QUOTE DIRECTLY. HE WAS PROVIDED INFORMATION ON BACKGROUND.

SO AS FAR AS WE ARE CONCERNED, THE USE OF THE TERM "VERBATIM" TO DESCRIBE THE CONVERSATIONS QUOTED IS INACCURATE. AND, IN FACT, I UNDERSTAND THAT MR. SHEEHAN

IN EFFECT SAID THAT THIS MORNING WHEN HE WAS INTERVIEWED ON TELEVISION.

Q. SO YOU ARE SAYING THAT THE STATE DEPARTMENT DID PROVIDE THIS INFORMATION?

A. WE HAVE ACKNOWLEDGED THAT MR. SHEEHAN HAD BACKGROUND CONVERSATIONS WITH A NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT. WE ALSO NOTE THAT HE SPOKE WITH MANY OTHER PEOPLE.

Q. WELL, I WOULD LIKE TO PURSUE THIS. IN OTHER WORDS YOU ARE SAYING THAT IF THE MATERIAL LEAKED ON THE HILL HAD BEEN PARAPHRASED, IT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE?

A. NO, I AM NOT SAYING THAT.

Q. WELL I AM ASKING --

A. -- I HAVE GONE BEYOND THAT. WE HAVE ALSO SAID, IN RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS, THAT INSOFAR AS ANYONE DID PROVIDE MR. SHEEHAN WITH INFORMATION BASED DIRECTLY ON MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATIONS -- JUST CHECK YOUR NOTES -- WE SAID IT WAS UNAUTHORIZED, IT WAS A SERIOUS ERROR OF JUDGMENT AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION WILL BE TAKEN.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 05 STATE 056699

Q. RIGHT, BUT I NOTICE THAT MR. SHEEHAN SAID ON THE "TODAY" SHOW THIS MORNING, "THEY HAVE QUESTIONED THE USE OF THE WORD 'VERBATIM' BUT THEY HAVE NOT QUESTIONED THE ACCURACY OF THE CONVERSATIONS."

A. AND AGAIN ON FRIDAY, IF YOU WILL CHECK THE PIECE OF PAPER YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU, WE SAID THAT WE ARE NOT GOING TO COMMENT ON ALLEGATIONS ABOUT THE SUBSTANCE OF CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN PRESIDENTS AND FOREIGN OFFICIALS --

Q. WELL, THE POINT I AM RAISING HERE IS --

A. -- BUT WE CANNOT SPEAK FOR OTHERS WITH WHOM MR. SHEEHAN MAY HAVE SPOKEN.

Q. THE POINT I AM RAISING HERE IS THAT THERE IS AN EXTRAORDINARY DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE REACTION YOU ARE EXPRESSING TO THESE ALLEGED LEAKS, AND THE OUTRAGE THAT WAS EXPRESSED ABOUT LEAKS ON THE -- IN CONGRESS.

A. THAT IS FOR YOU TO JUDGE WHETHER THERE IS AN EXTRAORDINARY DIFFERENCE. I THINK THE WORDS SPEAK

FOR THEMSELVES -- BOTH IN WHAT WE HAVE SAID ON FRIDAY
AND WHAT I AM SAYING TODAY BY WAY OF REITERATION.

Q. I AM NOT QUESTIONING ANY REPORTER'S RIGHT TO
GET AS MUCH INFORMATION AS HE CAN, ABOUT ANY SUBJECT.

BUT WHAT THE DISTINCTION HERE IS IN THE
DEPARTMENT'S REACTION TO WHAT IS HAPPENING WHEN MATERIAL
IS -- REACHES THE PUBLIC PRINT WHICH IS SELF-SERVING
IN MANY RESPECTS, IN MR. SHEEHAN'S ARTICLE -- SO FAR
AS THE SECRETARY IS CONCERNED --

AND WHAT YOU ARE SAYING IS THAT YOU WON'T DISCUSS
THE SUBSTANCE.

AND YOU ALSO SAY THAT DISCIPLINARY ACTION WILL
BE TAKEN IF IT IS DETERMINED THAT IT WAS BASED ON
UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 06 STATE 056699

A. RIGHT.

Q. THAT IS AN EXTRAORDINARILY DIFFERENT KIND OF
REACTION THAN THE STATE DEPARTMENT HAS EXPRESSED TO
THE LEAKAGE ON THE HILL.

IS THE STATE DEPARTMENT CONDUCTING AN INVESTI-
GATION?

I NOTICE YOU SAID YOU WERE "LOOKING INTO IT."

A. OBVIOUSLY, ONE DOES NOT TAKE DISCIPLINARY ACTION
CASUALLY.

Q. WELL THE STATE DEPARTMENT, OBVIOUSLY, KNOWS WHO
MR. SHEEHAN SPOKE TO BECAUSE YOUR STATEMENT ON FRIDAY
ACKNOWLEDGED THAT MR. SHEEHAN HAD SPOKEN TO A NUMBER
OF PEOPLE.

A. YES, HE HAD SPOKEN TO A NUMBER OF PEOPLE.

Q. WHAT IS IT YOU ARE INVESTIGATING, THEN?

A. EXACTLY WHAT I SAID -- JUST GO BACK TO WHAT I SAY.

Q. I WILL GO BACK TO WHAT YOU SAID:

YOU ARE SAYING THAT YOU INVESTIGATE --

A. I SAID THAT INSOFAR AS ANY STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIAL PROVIDED MR. SHEEHAN INFORMATION BASED DIRECTLY ON MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATION, DISCIPLINARY ACTION WILL BE TAKEN.

Q. DO YOU NOT KNOW BY READING THE ARTICLE WHETHER IT WAS BASED ON CLASSIFIED INFORMATION OR NOT?

A. AGAIN I WILL JUST REITERATE -- ALTHOUGH YOU ARE PRESSING FOR SOME SORT OF, I GUESS, IMMEDIATE ACTION -- WE ARE NOT GOING TO TAKE DISCIPLINARY ACTION UNTIL WE BELIEVE IT IS WARRANTED.
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 07 STATE 056699

Q. I AM NOT PRESSING FOR AN IMMEDIATE ACTION WHATSOEVER. I AM PRESSING FOR SOME CLEAR DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S REACTION TO LEAKS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S REACTION TO LEAKS FROM CONGRESS.

THE POSITIONS ARE BASICALLY INCONSISTENT.

A. HOW?

Q. HERE, YOU ARE SAYING THAT IF YOU DISCOVER THAT THERE IS ANY UNAUTHORIZED LEAKAGE, THAT YOU WILL TAKE DISCIPLINARY ACTION.

A. YES.

Q. THE SECRETARY, IN YOUR OWN STATEMENT ON FRIDAY -- YOU DESCRIBED IT AS A "GROSS VIOLATION."

A. RIGHT, AND I AM REITERATING THAT THIS MORNING.

Q. WELL, IF IT'S A GROSS VIOLATION --

A. I AM GLAD I BROUGHT THIS ALONG, SO WE CAN JUST READ TOGETHER WHAT WE SAID FRIDAY. WE SAID:

"INSOFAR AS MR. SHEEHAN WAS BRIEFED ON THE BASIS OF ANY OF OUR RECORDS OF CONVERSATION, THIS REPRESENTED A GROSS VIOLATION."

AND THAT IS THE SAME THING I AM SAYING TODAY.

Q. YOU DON'T KNOW? YOU DON'T KNOW AT THIS POINT? YOU HAVE THE ARTICLE IN FRONT OF YOU. YOU HAVE THE DOCUMENTS IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT, AND YOU STILL DON'T

KNOW IF IT DOES, OR DOES NOT REPRESENT ANY GROSS VIOLATION?

A. I AM NOT PREPARED TO GO BEYOND WHAT I HAVE JUST SAID.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 08 STATE 056699

Q. CAN YOU DESCRIBE TO US THE DEGREE OF KNOWLEDGE THAT THE SECRETARY HAD OF MR. SHEEHAN'S SEEING PEOPLE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT, AND THE LATITUDE OF THE AUTHORITY THAT, PRESUMABLY, HE GAVE TO SUBORDINATES TO BRIEF HIM?

IN OTHER WORDS, IS IT CONCEIVABLE THAT THE OFFICIAL WHO BRIEFED MR. SHEEHAN -- AND I AM ASSUMING ON MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATIONS -- WAS DOING SO IN GOOD FAITH PURSUANT TO DIRECTIVES FROM THE SECRETARY?

A. THAT IS KIND OF A HYPOTHETICAL QUESTION.

WE DID -- THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT PEOPLE IN THE STATE DEPARTMENT TALKED TO MR. SHEEHAN AND ON A BACKGROUND BASIS. BUT --

Q. WAS THAT AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY?

A. THE SECRETARY WAS AWARE OF IT, BUT I --

Q. WAS IT AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY?

A. I DON'T KNOW WHETHER HE WAS SPECIFICALLY ASKED -- BUT HE WAS AWARE OF IT, AND HE CERTAINLY WAS NOT OPPOSED TO IT.

Q. WERE THESE BACKGROUND CONVERSATIONS A GROSS VIOLATION OF TRUST AND CONFIDENCE?

A. WHAT WOULD HAVE BEEN A VIOLATION -- A GROSS VIOLATION WOULD HAVE BEEN IF HE HAD BEEN SHOWN, OR IF HE HAD BEEN BRIEFED ON THE BASIS OF MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATION, OR ON TRANSCRIPTS OF CONVERSATION.

UNCLASSIFIED

Q. HE KNEW HE WAS BACKGROUNDED.

A. BUT THERE IS A DIFFERENCE.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 09 STATE 056699

Q. WHY ISN'T THAT A GROSS VIOLATION?

I MEAN, YOU ARE ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE SECRETARY
WAS AT LEAST AWARE THAT MR. SHEEHAN WAS BEING BACK-
GROUNDED BY TOP OFFICIALS IN THE DEPARTMENT.

A. YES.

Q. ISN'T THAT A VIOLATION, OR GROSS VIOLATION OR
HOWEVER YOU WANT TO CALL IT?

A. NO. YOU HAVE BACKGROUND CONVERSATIONS IN THE
STATE DEPARTMENT ALL THE TIME AND --

Q. ARE THEY GROSS VIOLATIONS?

A. NO. IT DEPENDS ON THE JUDGMENT OF THE PERSON
TALKING.

IF ANY PERSON HAS LEAKED CLASSIFIED INFORMATION
TO YOU OR GIVEN YOU A CLASSIFIED PIECE OF PAPER, OR
PERMITTED YOU TO TAKE NOTES FROM IT -- THAT WOULD BE
A GROSS VIOLATION.

Q. EVEN IF IT IS AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY OF
STATE?

A. I AM NOT AWARE THAT THE SECRETARY HAS AUTHORIZED
THAT KIND OF A BACKGROUND BRIEFING.

Q. BUT IF THE SECRETARY IS AWARE OF ITS BEING DONE.

A. AWARE OF THE BACKGROUND -- TALKING ON BACKGROUND?
THERE IS A BIG DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THAT AND BRIEFING
SOMEONE ON THE BASIS OF MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATION.

Q. BUT PRESUMABLY, YOU ARE BRIEFING THEM ON THE
SUBSTANCE OF THOSE CONVERSATIONS -- AND WHAT'S THE
DIFFERENCE?

A. I THINK THERE IS A CRITICAL DIFFERENCE AND I
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 10 STATE 056699

THINK IT IS FOLLOWED IN MOST CONVERSATIONS THAT ARE ON
BACKGROUND.

THE PURPOSE OF THE BACKGROUND IS TO PERMIT MORE
GENERAL DISCUSSION -- BUT CERTAINLY NOT TO PROVIDE THE
KIND OF INFORMATION THAT IS ALLEGED HERE -- AND THAT
IS WHY WE THINK IT IS VERY SERIOUS.

Q. HOW MUCH TIME DID THE SECRETARY SPEND WITH
SHEEHAN ON THIS?

AND WHAT WAS THE BASIS FOR HIS BACKGROUND?

A. I DO NOT KNOW EXACTLY HOW MANY TIMES. I THINK
HE MET WITH HIM ONCE OR TWICE, VERY BRIEFLY -- LESS
THAN THIRTY MINUTES -- BUT LET ME CHECK THAT POINT
PRECISELY.

Q. JUST A MINUTE, JUST TO CLEAR UP ONE POINT:

ARE YOU USING THE TERMS "VERBATIM RECORDS OF
CONVERSATION" AND A "MEMO OF CONVERSATION" TO BE
IDENTICAL?

A. YES.

Q. EVEN THOUGH THEY ARE NOT? A MEMO OF A CONVER-
SATION WOULD BE A SUMMARY BUT IT WOULD NOT BE A VERBATIM
RECORD.

Q. YES, BUT YOU ARE USING IT IDENTICALLY?

A. YES.

Q. BUT YOU ARE USING THEM HERE AS BEING SYNONYMOUS?

A. RIGHT.

Q. AT WHAT LEVEL WOULD THE RELEASE OF A MEMCON HAVE
TO BE AUTHORIZED?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 11 STATE 056699

A. I DO NOT KNOW THAT RELEASE OF ANY MEMORANDA HAS
EVER BEEN AUTHORIZED.

Q. WOULD THE SECRETARY BE AUTHORIZED TO RELEASE A
MEMCON?

WOULD MR. SISCO? WOULD AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF STATE?

A. LET ME CHECK ON WHAT OUR RULES OF PROCEDURE ARE

IN THAT SORT OF SITUATION.

Q. DO YOU KNOW OF ANY PRECEDENT FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION BEING TAKEN IN A CASE LIKE THIS -- UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURES?

A. LET ME CHECK ON THAT.

Q. GIVE ME SOME IDEA OF WHAT KIND OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT -- CAN YOU --

A. NO, I DO NOT KNOW.

Q. WHO WOULD MAKE THE DETERMINATION OF UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE -- IF THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE, FOR EXAMPLE, WAS MADE BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE, WHO WOULD MAKE THAT DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER DISCIPLINARY ACTION WOULD BE TAKEN AGAINST THE SECRETARY?

A. HIS SUPERIOR IS THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Q. WELL THAT IS WHY WE ARE TRYING TO GET DOWN TO SPECIFICS HERE, AS TO WHO IS INVESTIGATING WHOM. IS THE PRESIDENT GOING TO INVESTIGATE THE SECRETARY?

A. WHY DON'T YOU ASK THE PRESIDENT?

Q. WELL IF YOU CAN --

A. I AM SPEAKING FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 12 STATE 056699

Q. WELL I WAS ASKING YOU ABOUT WHO IS GOING TO CONDUCT A DISCIPLINARY --

A. THE STATE DEPARTMENT IS LOOKING INTO IT.

Q. WITHIN WHAT -- SECURITY? OR --

A. I DO NOT KNOW WHICH OFFICE.

Q. WILL YOU TAKE THAT QUESTION?

A. I WILL LOOK INTO IT.

Q. IS IT FAIR TO SAY THAT AS OF NOW THERE REALLY ARE NO SPECIFIC DETAILS INsofar AS TO HOW AN INVESTIGATION WILL PROCEED -- WHO WILL BE NAMED TO IT, THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AND SO ON AND SO FORTH?

A. I DO NOT HAVE ANY OF THOSE DETAILS.

Q. WILL A LIE DETENTOR BE USED?

A. I DON'T KNOW -- I DON'T THINK WE CUSTOMARILY USE THEM.

Q. WE HAVE IN THE PAST.

Q. IT'S QUITE EVIDENT HERE -- CERTAINLY TO YOU AND TO ALL OF US -- THAT THIS DOES OPEN UP AN AREA THAT HAS BEEN TERRIBLY CLOUDY ALL THROUGH THE YEARS. THIS IS A REAL "TWILIGHT ZONE" HERE, IN WHICH PRESIDENTS, SECRETARIES OF STATE AND OTHER HIGH OFFICIALS HAVE, ON THEIR OWN, DECLASSIFIED DOCUMENTS IN THE COURSE OF CONVERSATIONS -- DISCUSSIONS WITH OTHER PEOPLE.

WE ALL KNOW THAT PRESIDENTS AND SECRETARIES AND OTHER OFFICIALS HAVE DONE THIS RIGHT ALONG, HERE.

ARE YOU ATTEMPTING NOW, TO DRAW SOME NEW DISTINCTION?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 13 STATE 056699

IS THERE SOME NEW BASIS HERE FOR MAKING A DETERMINATION THAT DISCIPLINARY ACTION WILL BE TAKEN AGAINST CERTAIN OFFICIALS IF THEY REVEAL CERTAIN PORTIONS OF CERTAIN CONVERSATIONS?

WHAT IS YOUR BASIC PREMISE HERE?

A. I DO NOT KNOW THAT I AM ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH SOME SORT OF GENERAL PRINCIPLE IN THIS REGARD.

THESE KINDS OF QUESTIONS, OBVIOUSLY, HAVE TO BE DECIDED ON A CASE-BY-CASE BASIS. IF SOMEONE DOES SOMETHING THAT IS UNAUTHORIZED, THEN WE HAVE TO JUDGE WHAT THAT PERSON OR PERSONS DID AND THEN TAKE APPROPRIATE ACTION.

Q. ISN'T THERE A PIECE OF PAPER ON WHICH THE SECRETARY SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZED BACKGROUND BRIEFINGS FOR MR. SHEEHAN?

A. I AM NOT AWARE OF ANY SUCH PIECE OF PAPER.

Q. YOU BEGAN BY SAYING, IN ANSWER TO YOUR FIRST QUESTION -- AND THEN YOU LATER SAID, "WELL, THIS IS

CONDITIONAL," THAT IT DOES NOT IMPLY THAT THERE NECESSARILY HAVE BEEN ANY VERBATIM ACCOUNTS. BUT AS I READ THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, "INsofar AS" MEANS THAT "TO THAT EXTENT" -- IT DOES NOT MEAN "IF."

IT MEANS THAT THERE WAS SOME BUT YOU SIMPLY DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH OF THE INFORMATION WAS RELEASED PUBLICLY.

A. WITHOUT GETTING INTO TOO FINE DEFINITION -- OBVIOUSLY IF WE WERE NOT CONCERNED, WE WOULD NOT BE SAYING WHAT WE ARE SAYING AND WE WOULD NOT HAVE SAID WHAT WE SAID ON FRIDAY.

Q. I AM JUST TRYING TO GET IT OUT OF THE CONDITIONAL TENSE.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 14 STATE 056699

IN OTHER WORDS, YOU ARE SAYING THAT THERE HAVE BEEN SOME VERBATIM ACCOUNTS OF CONVERSATIONS REPORTED IN THE ARTICLE AND YOU ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THEM AND ARE GOING TO DO SOMETHING ABOUT IT.

IS THAT RIGHT?

A. RIGHT, WE ARE CONCERNED.

Q. DOES IT ALSO FOLLOW FROM WHAT YOU SAY, SO THAT I UNDERSTAND IT, THAT THE SECRETARY, HIMSELF, IS THE SUBJECT OF INVESTIGATION?

A. NO, THAT WAS MURREY'S SUGGESTION -- HE WAS SUGGESTING THAT.

Q. AND WHAT WAS YOUR REPLY TO THAT?

A. HE ASKED ME WHO WOULD INVESTIGATE A SECRETARY OF STATE, AND I SAID, PRESUMABLY THE PRESIDENT. THAT IS WHO HE WORKS FOR.

Q. WELL NO, BUT I AM ASKING IT A DIFFERENT WAY:

IS THE SECRETARY HIMSELF -- IN OTHER WORDS YOU ARE GOING TO LOOK FOR THESE LEAKS, YOU SAY, INsofar AS THERE ARE LEAKS -- THEREFORE, DOES THE SECRETARY, HIMSELF, GET CONFRONTED WITH QUESTIONS AS TO THE LEAKAGE QUESTION?

A. I DO NOT THINK THAT, IN ANY WAY, APPLIES TO THE

PRESENT PROBLEM. ARE YOU ASKING IT IN A GENERAL CONTEXT?

Q. NO. I WAS ASKING IT IN THIS CONTEXT.

Q. WILL THE DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS BE MADE PUBLIC?

A. I JUST CANNOT GO BEYOND WHAT I HAVE SAID.

Q. YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT CONCERN ON THIS. WHAT DO
YOU MEAN BY "CONCERN"? IS IT CONCERN THAT SOME
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 15 STATE 056699

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION, SOME STATE SECRETS HAVE BEEN
GIVEN AWAY?

OR IS IT A CONCERN OVER THE POLITICAL REACTION?

IS THIS STATEMENT OF YOURS TODAY, -- THIS
INVESTIGATION -- A RESULT OF THE SAFIRE COLUMN THIS
MORNING, OR WHAT DOES IT RESULT FROM?

A. I DO NOT KNOW WHAT PROMPTED ALL THE QUESTIONS I
HAVE RECEIVED, BUT I REFER YOU TO WHAT WE SAID ON FRIDAY.
AND THAT WAS THAT WE RESPECT THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF
DIPLOMATIC CONVERSATIONS AND THE CONDUCT OF DIPLOMACY
DEPENDS UPON OTHERS HAVING CONFIDENCE THAT WHAT THEY
SAY TO US WILL REMAIN PRIVATE.

AND THAT REMAINS OUR FIRM POLICY.

Q. DID YOU SAY ANYTHING ABOUT INVESTIGATIONS ON
FRIDAY?

A. NO.

BUT ON FRIDAY, I DID SAY THAT IF ANYONE HAD MADE
UNAUTHORIZED BRIEFINGS, OR USED UNAUTHORIZED INFORMATION,
THAT WOULD BE A GROSS VIOLATION OF CONFIDENCE AND WAS
NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY.

Q. WHEN DID THE INVESTIGATION DEVELOP?

WHEN WAS THE INVESTIGATION --

A. WELL, THE ARTICLE ONLY CAME OUT TODAY, HENRY. WE
WERE POSED WITH THE QUESTION FRIDAY.

Q. THAT WAS LAST WEEK.

A. ALL I CAN SAY IS, I HAVE MADE CERTAIN STATEMENTS

ON FRIDAY, AND IN REITERATING THAT, I HAVE SAID IT A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY TODAY.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 16 STATE 056699

Q. CAN YOU FIND OUT SPECIFICALLY FOR US WHEN THE INVESTIGATION WAS DECIDED UPON AND LAUNCHED?

A. I WILL LOOK INTO IT.

Q. I WAS GOING TO FOLLOW UP ON HENRY'S. WAS THIS INVESTIGATION PROMPTED BY THE REPORT ITSELF IN FOREIGN POLICY, OR BY THE QUESTIONS FROM THE MEDIA, OR WHAT? MY POINT IS THAT SOME OF US HAVE HAD THAT ARTICLE IN OUR HANDS FOR WEEKS, AND I ASSUME THAT YOU DID, TOO; AND I DIDN'T NOTICE ANY CONCERN UNTIL THIS THING CAME UP FRIDAY WHEN YOU WERE QUESTIONED ON IT. SO, WHEN WAS THE CONCERN FIRST EVIDENCED -- WHEN THE ARTICLE WAS DISTRIBUTED, OR WHEN --

A. THE CONCERN WAS FELT WHEN WE FIRST BECAME AWARE OF ITS CONTENTS.

Q. THEN WE CAN ASSUME THAT THE INVESTIGATION HAS BEEN UNDERWAY FOR SOME WEEKS.

A. WE HAVE NOT HAD IT FOR SOME WEEKS.

Q. SOME DAYS? WE HAVE HAD IT FOR SOME WEEKS.

A. I WAS SHOWN A COPY OF IT A WEEK AGO -- I SHOULD PROTECT MY SOURCES -- BUT WE DID NOT RECEIVE A COPY FROM FOREIGN POLICY.

Q. BOB, I THINK YOU ARE LEAVING THE IMPRESSION THAT IT IS STILL A MYSTERY WHO SUPPLIED THE INFORMATION FROM THE MEMO OF CONVERSATION. BUT ISN'T IT REALLY A FACT FROM WHAT YOU HAVE SAID THAT IT IS KNOWN WHO BRIEFED MR. SHEEHAN; AND IT IS NOT A QUESTION OF SEARCHING OUT PEOPLE, IT IS REALLY A QUESTION OF WHETHER ONE OF A FEW PEOPLE COMMITTED WHAT THE DEPARTMENT REGARDS AS AN ERROR OF JUDGMENT. HAS THAT PERSON TOLD THE SECRETARY THAT HE IS FACT DID DO THIS? I THINK I ASKED THIS EARLIER. DOESN'T THE SECRETARY KNOW WHO ACTUALLY DID THIS, AND IT IS A QUESTION OF DECIDING WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 17 STATE 056699

A. UNLESS THERE ARE PEOPLE WE DO NOT KNOW ABOUT, YES, WE HAVE A FAIR IDEA AS TO WHO TALKED WITH HIM. BUT I AM NOT GOING TO PREJUDGE A DETERMINATION THAT HAS NOT BEEN MADE YET.

Q. I AM TRYING TO DISTINGUISH BETWEEN -- THERE IS A LOT OF TALK HERE ABOUT AN INVESTIGATION, AND THE OTHER -- WHAT I THINK IS THE CASE, FROM WHAT HAS BEEN SAID -- THAT ACTUALLY IT IS NOT AN INVESTIGATION, BUT REALLY A DECISION TO BE MADE ON WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT.

A. WE WILL MAKE A DETERMINATION AND THEN MAKE A DECISION.

Q. THE QUESTION I AM ASKING, DIRECTLY, DOES THE DEPARTMENT NOT IN FACT KNOW WHO SUPPLIED THESE MEMOS OF CONVERSATION?

A. I WOULD NOT AGREE WITH YOUR FINAL PHRASE. WE KNOW -- I THINK WE KNOW -- WHO ARE THE OFFICERS WHO BRIEFED MR. SHEEHAN IN GOOD FAITH, AND BRIEFED HIM ON A BACKGROUND BASIS.

Q. BUT YOU DON'T KNOW SPECIFICALLY WHO DID WHAT YOU REGARD AS A GROSS VIOLATION.

A. NO.

Q. CAN I TAKE YOUR ANSWER TO MR. KALB'S QUESTION TO MEAN THAT YOU ARE SAYING DR. KISSINGER HIMSELF DID NOT COMMIT AN ERROR OF JUDGMENT?

A. IN HIS BRIEFINGS WITH MR. SHEEHAN?

Q. YES.

A. ABSOLUTELY.

A. NOW, WAIT A MINUTE. I AM NOT MAKING A COMMITMENT TO GET ANSWERS TO ALL OF THE QUESTIONS BY THIS AFTERNOON. MY COMMITMENT IS, AND WHICH WE TRY TO DO, TO GET ANSWERS

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 18 STATE 056699

TO AS MANY QUESTIONS AS WE CAN. BUT I CANNOT AGREE IN ADVANCE THAT I CAN PROVIDE AN ANSWER TO EVERY QUESTION PUT IN THE BRIEFING THIS AFTERNOON.

Q. ALL RIGHT. I WOULD LIKE TO BE JUST A LITTLE

MORE SPECIFIC ON WHAT IT IS YOU ARE GOING TO TRY TO RESPOND TO, SO I DON'T EXPEND MY ENERGY TRYING TO FIND THE ANSWER THAT YOU ARE ALREADY GOING TO REPLY TO.

YOU ARE GOING TO TELL US, AS I UNDERSTAND --

A. I AM GOING TO TRY TO OBTAIN ANSWERS. I AM NOT SAYING I AM GOING TO GET AN ANSWER TO ALL OF THEM. THERE MAY BE INSTANCES IN THIS BRIEFING, AS THERE HAVE BEEN IN THE PAST, WHEN I WILL SAY I AM NOT ABLE TO PROVIDE FURTHER INFORMATION TO A QUESTION -- TO WHAT WE HAVE ALREADY SAID.

Q. BUT WE WILL BE GIVEN A NEGATIVE, SO WE WILL KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO IT.

A. RIGHT.

Q. THANK YOU.

Q. I WANT TO FIND OUT -- WHAT IS IT -- WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT YOU ARE GOING TO TRY TO GET RESPONSES TO? WOULD YOU CLARIFY YOUR ANSWER SO WE CAN SEE WHAT --

A. THERE HAVE BEEN ANY NUMBER OF QUESTIONS. MY MEMORY IS SUCH THAT I HAVE TO HAVE A COURT REPORTER HERE TO MAKE A TRANSCRIPT. I WILL LOOK THROUGH THE TRANSCRIPT AND WE WILL EXTRACT THE QUESTIONS.

Q. BUT THE POINT IS, WE STARTED OUT HERE AT A DIFFERENT POINT THAN WHICH WE ENDED UP. WE ENDED UP WITH YOU ACKNOWLEDGING THERE WAS AN INVESTIGATION GOING ON. AND IF THAT IS THE CASE, I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW THAT THAT WHOLE RANGE OF QUESTIONS -- WHEN IT WAS BEGUN, WHO IS CONDUCTING IT -- YOU HAD ANOTHER RANGE OF UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 19 STATE 056699

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE SECRETARY'S OWN DEGREE OF ACTIVITY WITH MR. SHEEHAN.

A. I ANSWERED THAT.

Q. NO. YOU SAID THAT YOU THOUGHT HE HAD SPOKEN TO HIM ONCE OR TWICE, AND PERHAPS FOR THIRTY MINUTES, BUT THAT YOU WOULD CHECK FURTHER ON THAT.

A. RIGHT.

Q. YOU WERE GOING -- AS I UNDERSTOOD, BECAUSE THIS

IS ONE I WAS PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN -- YOU WERE GOING TO TRY TO ASCERTAIN WHAT IT IS THAT THE DEPARTMENT IS INVESTIGATING.

IN OTHER WORDS, THE DISTINCTION THAT YOU ARE DRAWING BETWEEN WHAT REPRESENTS A GROSS VIOLATION OF CONFIDENCE AND WHAT MR. SHEEHAN WAS AUTHORIZED TO BE TOLD IN THESE CONVERSATIONS, BECAUSE THAT, TO ME, IS THE GUTS OF THE ISSUE HERE. WHAT IS IT THAT REPRESENTS A GROSS VIOLATION?

A. ALL RIGHT. BUT AT THE OUTSET, MURREY, I DID SAY THAT INSOFAR AS ANY OFFICIAL HAD PROVIDED MR. SHEEHAN WITH INFORMATION BASED DIRECTLY ON MEMORANDA OF CONVERSATIONS, DISCIPLINARY ACTION WOULD BE TAKEN.

Q. BUT YOU KEEP SAYING "INSOFAR AS."

A. THE REASON I AM SAYING IT, LESLIE, IS THAT WORDS GET CHANGED AROUND IN THE QUESTIONS, AND THEN THE THRUST BECOMES DIFFERENT AT THE END THAN THE WAY IT BEGAN.

Q. LET ME ASK THE QUESTION, THEN. IS IT NOT TRUE THAT MR. KISSINGER AND OTHER LEADERS IN THE DEPARTMENT ARE AWARE THAT THESE LEAKS CAME FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE?

A. I AM NOT PREPARED TO CONCEDE YOUR POINT. THAT UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 20 STATE 056699

IS NOT WHAT I SAID. I OBVIOUSLY PREFER MY WORDS OR I WOULD HAVE SAID IT DIFFERENTLY. AND OUR POSITION IS AS I STATED IT IN THE LANGUAGE THAT WE HAVE USED.

Q. ARE YOU SAYING YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER IT HAS COME FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT?

A. HAVE YOU READ THE ARTICLE?

Q. YES.

A. MR. SHEEHAN DOES SAY THAT HE SPOKE TO OTHER PEOPLE OTHER THAN STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS.

Q. I NOTICED THAT.

A. ALL RIGHT. DO YOU HAVE ANY REASON TO DOUBT THAT?

Q. LET ME ASK BERNIE'S QUESTION, AGAIN, BECAUSE I

WANT TO MAKE SURE OF YOUR ANSWER TO THAT QUESTION.
YOU ARE SAYING THAT THE DEPARTMENT DOESN'T KNOW WHO GAVE
THAT INFORMATION TO MR. SHEEHAN; AS OF NOW, THE DEPART-
MENT DOESN'T KNOW WHO GAVE THAT INFORMATION TO
MR. SHEEHAN?

A. I DO NOT THINK THAT IS WHAT BERNIE ASKED.

Q. I AM ASKING THAT QUESTION.

A. BERNIE'S POINT -- HE ASKED, AND I SAID THAT --

Q. FORGET ABOUT BERNIE'S QUESTION AND ANSWER MINE.

A. -- WE THINK WE KNOW WHO ARE THE VARIOUS PEOPLE
IN THE BUILDING WHO BRIEFED MR. SHEEHAN ON A BACKGROUND
BASIS. POINT ONE --

Q. I AM NOT ASKING THAT QUESTION.

A. ALL RIGHT, WHAT IS YOUR QUESTION?

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 21 STATE 056699

Q. IS THE LEADERSHIP OF THE DEPARTMENT AWARE OF
WHICH MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT GAVE THIS INFORMATION
TO MR. SHEEHAN?

A. WHO MAY HAVE GIVEN HIM UNAUTHORIZED INFORMATION?

Q. WHO DID GIVE IT?

A. I HAVE NOT BEEN INFORMED ABOUT THAT YET. AND
THE THRUST OF MY COMMENT OBVIOUSLY IS THAT A DETERMINA-
TION STILL HAS TO BE MADE.

Q. WHO MAY HAVE GIVEN IT?

A. I THINK THAT CAME OUT IN PREVIOUS QUESTIONS AND
ANSWERS.

Q. DO THE INDIVIDUALS IN QUESTION, THOSE WHO DID
BRIEF MR. SHEEHAN, DO THEY MAINTAIN THAT THEY WERE
AUTHORIZED TO DO SO BY THE SECRETARY?

A. I DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEY MAINTAIN. I HAVE NOT
BEEN A PARTY TO THAT --.

Q. WILL YOU TAKE THAT QUESTION?

A. YES.

Q. WILL YOU ALSO TAKE THIS QUESTION? DOES ANYONE ACKNOWLEDGE TO THE DEPARTMENT EXACTLY WHAT THEY HAVE GIVEN TO MR. SHEEHAN? IN OTHER WORDS, I WOULD THINK BY THIS POINT YOU WOULD HAVE ALREADY CONDUCTED WHATEVER INQUIRIES WERE NECESSARY AND WOULD KNOW WHO GAVE HIM WHAT.

A. BUT ON THE SPECIFIC QUESTION, WHAT I AM PREPARED TO SAY TODAY IS WHAT I SAID AT THE OUTSET. AND I AM NOT ABLE TO GO BEYOND THAT AT THIS POINT. I THINK THAT SHOULD BE PRETTY CLEAR FROM THE EXCHANGES WE HAVE BEEN HAVING.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 22 STATE 056699

Q. WHAT DID YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAID HERE EARLIER THAT WE KNOW WHO BRIEFED SHEEHAN IN GOOD FAITH? WHAT DOES THAT PHRASE "IN GOOD FAITH" MEAN?

A. THAT WAS REFERRING TO OUR STATEMENT ON FRIDAY, IN WHICH MR. SHEEHAN WAS BRIEFED AND HE UNDERSTOOD, AS

.
UNCLASSIFIED
I AM TOLD, THAT THE GROUND RULES OF THE INFORMATION HE RECEIVED WAS ON BACKGROUND.

Q. BUT EVEN SO, HAD ANYONE WHO HAD CARRIED OUT A BRIEFING DIRECTLY REFERRED TO A MEMCON, THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN A SERIOUS, SO FORTH AND SO ON. SO WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN THE "GOOD FAITH?" I DON'T SEE WHAT THEY WOULD HAVE TOLD THEM, WHERE THE GOOD FAITH FACTOR ENTERS, BECAUSE THAT WOULD SEEM TO SUGGEST THAT SHEEHAN HAD VIOLATED AN ASSURANCE THAT SHEEHAN HIMSELF HAD EXTENDED TO A BRIEFER.

A. I AM NOT ABLE AT THIS MOMENT TO PROVIDE THE BRIDGE TO THE TWO SITUATIONS.

Q. COULD YOU GIVE THE DEPARTMENT'S CHARACTERIZATION OF MR. SAFIRE'S ASSERTION THIS MORNING THAT IT WAS THE SECRETARY HIMSELF WHO LEAKED THE DOCUMENTS?

A. THAT IS ABSOLUTELY FALSE.

Q. FALSE.

Q. JUST ANOTHER QUESTION ON THIS. IS IT MAINTAINED BY THOSE WHO DID BRIEF MR. SHEEHAN THAT HE IN ANY WAY

VIOLATED THEIR UNDERSTANDING OF THOSE BRIEFINGS?

A. I HAVE NOT DISCUSSED THE QUESTION WITH ANY OF THE PEOPLE WHO BRIEFED MR. SHEEHAN.

Q. SO YOU DON'T KNOW WHETHER THEY MAINTAIN THAT.

A. I DO NOT KNOW WHAT THEIR POSITION IS.
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 23 STATE 056699

Q. COULD YOU TAKE THAT QUESTION?

A. I WILL LOOK INTO IT.

Q. DO YOU KNOW HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED?

A. HOW MANY PEOPLE SPOKE TO MR. SHEEHAN?

Q. YES.

A. NO, I DO NOT.

Q. DO YOU KNOW WHETHER THE MOST SENIOR OFFICIALS, IN ADDITION TO THE SECRETARY, DID SPEAK WITH MR. SHEEHAN?

Q. I AM ASKING YOU, TO BE SPECIFIC, WHETHER MR. SHEEHAN SPOKE TO MR. SISCO, MR. ATHERTON, AND PEOPLE AT THAT LEVEL?

A. I WILL CHECK INTO IT. I THINK YOU ASKED EARLIER FOR AN IDENTIFICATION OF THE PEOPLE WITH WHOM HE HAD SPOKEN, AND I SAID I WOULD LOOK INTO IT.

Q. DOES YOUR INQUIRY EXTEND BEYOND THE BORDERS OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT? ARE YOU CHECKING WITH THE NSC, THE CIA, WITH OTHER EMBASSIES?

A. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING THAT WE ARE CONCERNED WITH WHAT HAPPENED IN THIS BUILDING.

Q. CAN YOU ALSO CHECK WHETHER A REQUEST WAS MADE OF THE NSC TO SEND OVER SOME OF THESE MEMCON'S IN ORDER THAT MR. SHEEHAN BE BRIEFED?

A. I WILL CHECK INTO THAT. I HAD NOT HEARD THAT BEFORE.

Q. AMBASSADOR DINITZ TODAY GAVE A SPEECH TO A GROUP OF JEWISH WOMEN IN WHICH HE CHARACTERIZED THE ESTABLISH-

MENT OF A MILITARY SUPPLY RELATIONSHIP WITH EGYPT AS A
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 24 STATE 056699

DANGEROUS COURSE OF ACTION, WHICH WILL CAUSE A DANGEROUS
IMBALANCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

NOW, APART FROM YOUR DISAGREEMENT WITH THAT KIND
OF CHARACTERISTIC, IS IT PROPER, IN YOUR VIEW, FOR THE
AMBASSADOR OF ANOTHER COUNTRY TO MAKE SUCH PUBLIC
STATEMENTS TO AN AMERICAN AUDIENCE? IS THAT INTERFERENCE
WITH DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, THAT SORT OF THING?

A. I AM REALLY NOT PREPARED TO PROVIDE A JUDGMENT
ON THAT. THE SECRETARY INDICATED IN ATLANTA IN HIS
NEWS CONFERENCE, WHEN HE WAS ASKED IN SORT OF GENERAL
TERMS ABOUT THIS SUBJECT, THAT THE DECISION ITSELF ABOUT
A MILITARY SUPPLY RELATIONSHIP WITH ANOTHER COUNTRY WAS
OBVIOUSLY A DECISION FOR US TO MAKE AND NOT FOR SOMEONE
ELSE TO MAKE FOR US.

Q. BO, SOMETHING ELSE. HOW DO YOU VIEW THE SITUATION
IN NORTHERN AFRICA, THE BREAKING OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS
BETWEEN ALGERIA AND MOROCCO?

A. WE ARE OBVIOUSLY WATCHING THAT SITUATION VERY
CAREFULLY. WE HAVE SAID IN THE PAST, AND I WILL JUST

REAFFIRM IT TODAY, THAT THE SAHARA IS A MATTER FOR
NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENTS CONCERNED WITHIN
THEIR REGIONAL CONTEXT. WE CONTINUE TO HOPE THAT THEY
WILL SETTLE THEIR DIFFERENCES OVER THE SAHARA PEACE-
FULLY.

Q. BOB, I WAS JUST WONDERING IF YOU HAVE ANY UP-DATE
ON THE PANAMA CITY CONFERENCE ON ARAMCO?

A. ONLY THAT THERE IS A MEETING TAKING PLACE BETWEEN
SHEIK YAMANI AND ARAMCO, AND ANY DETAILS WILL HAVE TO
COME FROM THE PARTICIPANTS TO THE MEETING. KISSINGER

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: PRESS COMMENTS, PRESS CONFERENCES, BRIEFING MATERIALS, PEACE TALKS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 09 MAR 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: n/a
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: n/a
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment:
Disposition Date: 01 JAN 1960
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976STATE056699
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: MVANORDER:DP
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760088-0535
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760379/aaaacrzh.tel
Line Count: 1130
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN NEA
Original Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 21
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: n/a
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ShawDG
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 SEP 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 SEP 2004 by meiwc>; APPROVED <21 OCT 2004 by ShawDG>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: DEPARTMENT PRESS BRIEFING FOR YOUR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE FOLLOWING ARE EXCERPTS
TAGS: PFOR, XF, US, (SHEEHAN, EDWARD R F)
To: ALGIERS MULTIPLE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006